

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,107	12/20/2001	Scott A. Olson	CM03409J	3391
22917 75	590 08/05/2005		EXAM	INER
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD			BASHORE, ALAIN L	
IL01/3RD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			1762	
			DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/029,107	OLSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
	·	Alain L. Bashore	1762			
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover shee	with the correspondence address			
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repi period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute apply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, ma ly within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) I e, cause the application to becom	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 J	une 2005.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9-16</u> is/are pending in the ap	plication.				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	-				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9-16</u> is/are rejected.		·			
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	•			
Application	n Papers					
9)[7]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
· ·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		to by the Examiner.			
-	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		-			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the draw	ing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) 🔲 🗀	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attac	hed Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr	n priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		•			
	1. Certified copies of the priority document					
	2. Certified copies of the priority document					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	en received in this National Stage			
* 0	application from the International Burea	, , , ,	ant received			
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies i	iot received.			
A44.a.h	(a) ·					
Attachment	s) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗆 Intervis	ew Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper	No(s)/Mail Date			
	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5)	of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
J.S. Patent and Tra PTOL-326 (Re		ction Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 08032005			

Art Unit: 1762

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 6, 12, 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Heuvel et al in view of Snelgrove et al

Van den Heuvel et al discloses a method of configuring a subscriber unit for operation in a wireless communication system. There is obtained a set of available wireless services from an information source that advertises wireless services in the form of a list (col 4, lines 47-65). Particular criteria desired in a service is described as part of the list (col 3, lines 55-67). A particular service provider is selected from the list (col 4, lines 6-9), and there is established a subscription relationship with the particular service provider (col 4, lines 9-31).

Van den Heuvel et al does not disclose a brokering agent to supply the list where a particular criteria is supplied the agent to further define the list so as to select a particular service provider.

Art Unit: 1762

Snelgrove et al discloses a brokering agent to supply the list where a particular criteria is supplied the agent to further define the list so as to select a particular service provider (para 0077-0078).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a brokering agent to supply the list where a particular criteria is supplied the agent to further define the list so as to select a particular service provider because Snelgrove et al teaches optimizing terms between users and telecommunication providers (see abstract).

3. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Heuvel et al in view of Snelgrove et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Noreen et al

Van den Heuvel et al and Snelgrove et al do not disclose subcarrier transmission over broadcast channel having information on available wireless services.

Noreen et al discloses subcarrier transmission over broadcast channel having information (para 0011-0012).

Art Unit: 1762

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include disclose subcarrier transmission over broadcast channel having information on available wireless services because Noreen et al teaches advantages to such an information providing system (para 0006).

4. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Heuvel et al in view of Snelgrove et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Palermo.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van den Heuvel et al in view of Snelgrove et al in further view of Noreen et al as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Palermo.

Van den Heuvel et al, Snelgrove et al, and Palermo do not disclose creating operating nodes within the subscriber unit to support differing wireless communication protocols.

Palermo discloses creating operating nodes within the subscriber unit to support differing wireless communication protocols (col 4, lines 38-63).

Art Unit: 1762

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include creating operating nodes within the subscriber unit to support differing wireless communication protocols because Palermo teaches protocol differences (col 4, lines 38-63).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The controller (206) to Van den Heuvel et al appears to meet the recitation of "brokering agent" as broadly claimed by applicant.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/029,107

Art Unit: 1762

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Regarding all Class 705 applications, the management contact regarding examination is: Vincent Millin (SPE, art unit 3624) at 571-272-6747.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alain L. Bashore Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762